SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street

12th Floor

Los Angeles, California

90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800

f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

MEETING OF THE

TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, March 27, 2007
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

SCAG Offices
818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor
Conference Room – Riverside A
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.236.1800

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Jonathan Nadler at 213.236.1884 or nadler@scag.ca.gov

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1868 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1868.

Doc # 131289

Transportation Conformity Working Group

AGENDA

			PAGE #	TIME
1.0	CALL TO ORDER	Brad McAllister, Metro		
2.0	PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD **Members of the public desiring to speak on an agenda item or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of this committee, must fill out a speaker's card prior to speaking and submit it to the Staff Assistant. A speaker's card must be turned in before the meeting is called to order. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The Chair may limit the total time for comments to twenty (20) minutes.**			
3.0	CONSENT CALENDAR			
	3.1 Approve Minutes of February 27, 2007 Meeting **Attachment**		1	
4.0	INFORMATION ITEMS			
	4.1 RTP Update	Naresh Amatya, SCAG		5 minutes
	4.2 RTIP Update	John Asuncion, SCAG		10 minutes
	4.3 AQMP Update	SCAQMD		15 minutes
	4.4 Review of Qualitative PM Hot Spot Analysis **Attachment**	TCWG Discussion	8	30 minutes
	4.5 Review of PM Hot Spot Interagency Review Forms **Attachment**	TCWG Discussion	18	15 minutes
5.0	CHAIR'S REPORT			5 minutes
6.0	INFORMATION SHARING			10 minutes
	6.1 Statewide Conformity Working Group Schedule			

Transportation Conformity Working Group

AGENDA

PAGE # TIME

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Transportation Conformity Working Group will be on Tuesday, April 24, 2007 at the SCAG office in downtown Los Angeles.

TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY WORKING GROUP
of the
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS'

February 27, 2007
Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY WORKING GROUP. AN AUDIOCASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.

The Transportation Conformity Working Group held its meeting at the SCAG office in Los Angeles.

In Attendance:

Naresh Amatya	SCAG
John Asuncion	SCAG
Rosemary Ayala	SCAG
Nasrin Behmanesh	Parsons
Scott Cohen	West Coast Environmental
Sheryll Del Rosario	SCAG
Kevin Haboian	Parsons
Gary Hansen	City of Westlake Village
Lori Huddleston	MTA/Metro
Shawn Kuk	SCAG
Michael Litschi	OCTA
Betty Mann	SCAG
Brad McAllester	MTA/Metro
Shirley Medina	RCTC
Jonathan Nadler	SCAG
Arnie Sherwood	ITS UC Berkley/SCAG
Carla Walecka	TCA

Via Teleconference:

Arman Behtash	Caltrans District 12
Ron Bloomburg	CH2MHill, Riverside County
Mike Brady	Caltrans Headquarters
Ben Cacatian	Ventura County APCD
Andrew Yoon	Caltrans District 7
Paul Fagan	Caltrans District 8
Eileen Gallo	Caltrans Headquarters
Carol Gomez	South Coast AQMD
Sandy Johnson	Caltrans District 11

TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY WORKING GROUP
of the
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS'

February 27, 2007
Minutes

Steve Keal	CH2MHill, Riverside County
Amy Klamo	CH2MHill, Riverside County
Keith Lay	LFA Associates
Tony Louka	Caltrans District 8
Jean Mazur	FHWA
Karina O'Conner	EPA Region 9
Lisa Poe	SANBAG
Dennis Wade	ARB

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Brad McAllister, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:08 a.m.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1 Approval Item

3.1 Approve January 30, 2007 Meeting Minutes

Typographical error - 4.1, last sentence of first paragraph and first sentence of the second paragraph, the 2006 STIP Amendment has not been approved by the CTC's until June 7th. Correction - CTC is ***California*** Transportation Commission not County Transportation Commission.

Page 5, first paragraph, there is a typo which reads that the target date for the start of the 30 day public review is April 5, it should be April ***25,*** ending on May 24.

Chair McAllister made a MOTION to MOVE the minutes.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 RTP Update

Naresh Amatya, SCAG, reported on the Administrative Amendment (previously referred to as the "Gap Analysis"), which is intended to bring the 2004 RTP into compliance with the planning requirements of SAFETEA-LU. The Administrative Amendment is scheduled to go to the Regional Council for adoption on May 1, 2007.

The document was released for public comments in December and comments were received from FHWA and Caltrans. FHWA's comments focused primarily on the public participation document aspect, document consultation, and issues related to the environmental mitigation component of planning. Staff has revised the document as appropriate and has also documented the comments as part of the process. Staff also received a comment from Caltrans supporting the Gap Analysis process and its findings and their concurrence with the process.

Mr. Amatya also briefed the Working Group on the potential Amendment to the existing 2004 RTP. This current Amendment to the 2004 RTP addresses the recent development of the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) program, which intends to allocate an additional $4.5 billion in transportation funding for highway related infrastructure improvements in the State of California. There are a number of projects that are not currently in the plan or need to be amended in terms of schedule, scope, cost, etc. Staff is preparing an Amendment to the 2004 RTP in order to incorporate the changes that are going to result from the authorization of the projects. Staff is working to complete and submit the Amendment to the federal agencies prior to July 1, 2007.

The TCWG will be kept apprised of this process.

4.2 RTIP Update

John Asuncion, SCAG, discussed the preparation of Draft Administrative Amendment to the 2006 RTIP per SAFETEA-LU ("Gap Analysis"). The RTIP is required to be compliant with SAFETEA-LU by July 1, 2007. Should the RTIP fail to meet SAFETEA-LU requirements by July 1, 2007,

there will be severe amendment restrictions to the RTIP which will lead to delays in project delivery. In response to these concerns and to ensure compliance with the SAFETEA-LU requirements by the statutory deadline of July 1, 2007, a Draft Administrative Amendment was deemed necessary so that the RTIP Amendment process may continue without disruption. The Draft Administrative Amendment will address any deficiencies in the RTIP to ensure compliance with SAFETEA-LU requirements.

This Draft Administrative Amendment reaffirms the 2006 RTIP transportation conformity analysis. There are no changes to the required conformity components; there are also no changes to the scope, cost, or delivery schedule for any of the projects or programs identified in the current TIP. All amendments to the 2006 RTIP since its adoption have demonstrated financial constraint to the financial plan and all future amendments will continue to do so.

The Draft Administrative Amendment is going to be considered by SCAG's Transportation & Communications Committee, TCC, on March 1. Staff recommends that the TCC approve the release of the Administrative Amendment to the 2006 RTIP for a 30-day public comment period and adoption by Regional Council subsequent to the successful conclusion of the comment period. Upon adoption of the final Administrative Amendment to the 2006 RTIP by the Regional Council, staff will forward it to the FHWA/FTA for certification, which is anticipated to take place prior to the established statutory deadline of July 1, 2007.

4.3 TCM Update: Caltrans TCM Substitution Report

Jonathan Nadler, SCAG, described the public review process for the TCM substitution, including an update on the Caltrans TCM substitution that involved going from a full-time HOV to part-time on the last 8 miles of a segment in Riverside County. There was a request from the South Coast AQMD to extend the comment period. Staff extended the comment period until February 26 and has received no additional comments. The report is scheduled to be heard by the Regional Council on March 1.

Jean Mazur, AQMD, asked when the substitute measures would be implemented. Mr. Nadler responded that one substitution was scheduled for

July and the other was likely to occur prior to that. Page 5 of the Staff Report reflects that the Projects are expected to be operational by mid-2007.

4.4 AQMP Update

Carol Gomez, South Coast AQMD, informed the Working Group that there was a meeting between upper management and staff from AQMD and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in Sacramento, which was intended to resolve certain issues. Ms. Gomez did not have the details of the meeting. AQMD plans to release the modifications to the Draft 2007 AQMP on its website by the end of the week. The public workshops will be held March 13 and 15 in the four counties.

4.5 Review of Qualitative PM Hot Spot Analysis

Jean Mazur, inquired if the project sponsor had been able to find an existing monitor that would be representative of the proposed project.

Andrew Yoon, Caltrans District 7, responded on behalf of the project sponsor, the Port of Long Beach. Mr. Yoon verified that the corridor is near the port, which has high heavy-duty diesel truck traffic, such that there are not many monitoring stations that are representative. The monitor used in the analysis is in north Long Beach, which is the most representative. There are a couple of MATES monitoring stations in Wilmington and on Pacific Coast Highway, which were installed for the short-term MATES study, limiting the amount of historical data available.

Mr. Nadler stated that the ports have started, or will start, to do their own air quality monitoring. Mr. Nadler also pointed out that since there would generally not be a perfect monitoring station, we still need to move forward with the analysis and conclusions using the best available data. Mr. Nadler stated that the project sponsor should include additional data if available and relevant. It is assumed that such data will not change the conclusions. Otherwise, the TCWG would need to review once again.

The TCWG concluded that they would conditionally approve the current draft analysis subject to EPA and FHWA concurrence which would presumably take place at a sub-group meeting next week. Staff will set the date and setup a conference call for those who wish to participate.

4.6 Review of PM Hot Spot Interagency Review Forms

The TCWG considered seven interagency review forms to determine whether the projects were of air quality concern and required a qualitative PM Hot Spot analysis. The review concluded the following:

SBD20040826 and SBD200619: Not a POAQC, hot spot analysis not required
SBD200157: Not a POAQC - hot spot analysis not required
RIV990701: Not a POAQC - hot spot analysis not required
RIV46460: Not a POAQC - hot spot analysis not required
SBD200048: Not a POAQC - hot spot analysis not required
LA0B7234: Not a POAQC - hot spot analysis not required
LA960142: Not a POAQC - hot spot analysis not required

4.7 PM Project Level Screening

Mr. Nadler stated that there was recently a Sub-group meeting where project level screening was discussed. The Sub-group is still working on developing the screening and will eventually bring it forward to the TCWG to get some consensus and move on from there. Assuming that something can be worked out in the next month or two it may be reviewed at the next Statewide Conformity Working Group meeting.

5.0 CHAIR'S REPORT

No new items to report.

6.0 INFORMATION SHARING

6.1 1-hr Ozone Standard Court Decision

Mr. Nadler said that Staff had added this item to the agenda at the request of South Coast AQMD but he had nothing to report beyond the update given at last month's meeting, which is reflected in the minutes. Karina O'Conner, EPA, stated that EPA has received an extension from the Court until May 22 to respond to the decision and probably will not have additional information.

The next Statewide Conformity Working Group meeting will probably be held on May 23 at AQMD Headquarters in Diamond Bar.

Ventura County Air Pollution Control District is scheduled to send out notices release of its 2007 Draft AQMP for the 8-hr Ozone standard this week.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

Brad McAllester, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 11:15 p.m.

The next Transportation Conformity Working Group meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 27, 2007 at the SCAG office in Los Angeles.

AIR QUALITY STUDY

I-5 CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

TECHNICAL ADDENDUM 0.1

$PM_{2.5}$ AND PM_{10} ANALYSES

Submitted to:

Caltrans District 7
Division of Environmental Planning
100 S. Main Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

Prepared by:

LSA Associates, Inc.
20 Executive Park, Suite 200
Irvine, California 92614
(949) 553-0666

LSA Project No. CDT532B

LSA

July, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) has prepared this Air Quality Technical Addendum for the Transportation Study I-5 Corridor Improvement Project in response to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) releasing new $PM_{2.5}$[1] and PM_{10}[2] hotspot analysis requirements in its March 10, 2006 final transportation conformity rule (71 FR 12468). The 2006 Final Rule supersedes the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) existing September 12, 2001, "Guidance for Qualitative Project-Level: Hotspot Analysis in PM_{10} Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas." This technical addendum addresses these new requirements. This technical addendum is an addendum to the Air Quality Analysis for the Interstate 5 (I-5) Corridor Improvement project dated September 2005.

$PM_{2.5}$ AND PM_{10} HOTSPOT METHODOLOGY

The new Final Rule establishes the transportation conformity criteria and procedures for determining which transportation projects must be analyzed for local air quality impacts in $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} nonattainment and maintenance areas. The proposed project is located in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), which has been designated as a federal nonattainment area for both $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}; therefore, a hotspot analysis is required for both pollutants.

A hotspot analysis is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) (40 CFR 93.101) as an estimation of likely future localized $PM_{2.5}$ or PM_{10} pollutant concentrations and a comparison of those concentrations to the relevant air quality standards. A hotspot analysis assesses the air quality impacts on a scale smaller than an entire nonattainment or maintenance area, including, for example, congested roadway intersections and highways or transit terminals. Such an analysis is a means of demonstrating that a transportation project meets Clean Air Act conformity requirements to support state and local air quality goals with respect to potential localized air quality impacts. When a hotspot analysis is required, it is included within the project-level conformity determination that is made by the FHWA or the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Clean Air Act Section 176(c)(1)(B) is the statutory criterion that must be met by all projects in nonattainment and maintenance areas that are subject to transportation conformity. Section 176(c)(1)(B) states that federally supported transportation projects must not "cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area; increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area."

Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS). $PM_{2.5}$ nonattainment and maintenance areas are required to attain and maintain two standards:

- 24-hour standard: 65 micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$)
- Annual standard: 15.0 $\mu g/m^3$

The current 24-hour standard is based on a 3-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations; the current annual standard is based on a 3-year average of annual mean $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations. A $PM_{2.5}$ hotspot analysis must consider both standards unless it is determined for a

[1] Particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter.
[2] Particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter.

given area that meeting the controlling standard would ensure that Clean Air Act requirements are met for both standards. The interagency consultation process should be used to discuss how the qualitative $PM_{2.5}$ hotspot analysis meets statutory and regulatory requirements for both $PM_{2.5}$ standards, depending on the factors that are evaluated for a given project.

PM_{10} nonattainment and maintenance areas are required to attain and maintain two standards as well:

- 24-hour standard: 150 $\mu g/m^3$
- Annual standard: 50 $\mu g/m^3$

The 24-hour PM_{10} standard is attained when the average number of exceedances in the previous three calendar years is less than or equal to 1.0. An exceedance occurs when a 24-hour concentration of 155 $\mu g/m^3$ or greater is measured at a site. The annual PM_{10} standard is attained if the average of the annual arithmetic means for the previous three calendar years is less than or equal to 50 $\mu g/m^3$. A PM_{10} hotspot analysis must consider both standards unless it is determined for a given area that meeting the controlling standard would ensure that Clean Air Act requirements are met for both standards. The interagency consultation process should be used to discuss how the qualitative PM_{10} hotspot analysis meets statutory and regulatory requirements for both PM_{10} standards, depending on the factors that are evaluated for a given project.

To meet statutory requirements, the March 10, 2006 Final Rule requires $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} hotspot analyses to be performed for Projects of Air Quality Concern (POAQC). The Final Rule states that projects not identified in 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) as projects of air quality concern have met statutory requirements without any further hotspot analyses (40 CFR 93.116[a]).

$PM_{2.5}$ AND PM_{10} HOTSPOT ANALYSIS

Projects of Air Quality Concern (POAQC)

The first step in the hotspot analysis is to determine whether a project meets the standard for a POAQC. The EPA specified in 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) of the Final Rule that POAQC are certain highway and transit projects that involve significant levels of diesel vehicle traffic, or any other project that is identified in the $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} State Implementation Plan (SIP) as a localized air quality concern. The Final Rule defines the POAQC that require a $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} hotspot analysis in 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1) as:

i. New or expanded highway projects that have a significant number of or significant increase in diesel vehicles;

ii. Projects affecting intersections that are at Level-of-Service D, E, or F with a significant number of diesel vehicles, or those that will change to Level-of-Service D, E, or F because of increased traffic volumes from a significant number of diesel vehicles related to the project;

iii. New bus and rail terminals and transfer points that have a significant number of diesel vehicles congregating at a single location;

iv. Expanded bus and rail terminals and transfer points that significantly increase the number of diesel vehicles congregating at a single location; and

v. Projects in or affecting locations, areas, or categories of sites which are identified in the $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} applicable implementation plan or implementation plan submission, as appropriate, as sites of violation or possible violation.

Proposed Project

This project clearly meets the criteria of the first item above, as the project proposes adding one or more lanes to the I-5 freeway, resulting in significant increases in traffic including diesel vehicles. Therefore, this project is a POAQC and $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} Hotspots analyses are required.

Types of Emissions Considered

In accordance with "Transportation Conformity Guidance for Qualitative Hot-spot Analyses in $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas" (Guidance) developed by the EPA in conjunction with the FHWA in March 2006, this hot-spot analysis will be based only on directly emitted $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. Tailpipe, brake wear, and tire wear $PM_{2.5}$ emissions will be considered in this hot-spot analysis.

Vehicles cause dust from paved and unpaved roads to be re-entrained, or re-suspended, in the atmosphere. According to the March 10, 2006 final rule, road dust emissions are only to be considered in $PM_{2.5}$ hot-spot analyses if the EPA or the state air agency has made a finding that such emissions are a significant contributor to the $PM_{2.5}$ air quality problem (40 CFR 93.102(b)(3)). The EPA or the California Air Resources Board (ARB) has not yet made such finding of significance; and therefore, the re-entrained $PM_{2.5}$ is not considered in this analysis.

Secondary particles formed through $PM_{2.5}$ precursor emissions from a transportation project take several hours to form in the atmosphere giving emissions time to disperse beyond the immediate project area of concern for localized analyses; therefore, they will not be considered in this hot-spot analysis. Secondary emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ are considered as part of the regional emission analysis prepared for the conforming RTP and FTIP.

According to the project schedules, the construction will not last more than 5 years, and construction-related emissions may be considered temporary; therefore, any construction-related $PM_{2.5}$ emissions due to this project will not be included in this hot-spot analysis. This project will comply with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Fugitive Dust Rules for any fugitive dusts emitted during the construction of this project. Excavation, transportation, placement, and handling of excavated soils will result in no visible dust migration. A water truck or tank will be available within the project limits at all times to suppress and control the migration of fugitive dusts from earthwork operations.

Analysis Method

This Hotspots analysis relies on air quality data from monitoring stations along the length of the proposed project. This data is compared with AAQS and examined for trends in order to predict future conditions in the project vicinity. Additionally, the impacts of the project are discussed and the likelihood of these impacts interacting with the ambient $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} levels to cause hotspots.

Data Considered

Baseline PM_{10} Emissions

The monitored PM_{10} concentrations at the Anaheim-Pampas Lane Station and at the Los Angeles-North Main St. Station, shown in Table A (the two closest stations monitoring PM_{10}), indicate that neither the federal 24-hour PM_{10} AAQS (150 $\mu g/m^3$) nor the federal annual AAQS (50 $\mu g/m^3$) were exceeded between 2003 and 2005. These measured concentrations were significantly below the annual and 24-hour PM_{10} standards. The original Air Quality Technical Study (September 2005) used monitored data from 2000 through 2002; no exceedances of the annual and 24-hour PM_{10} AAQS occurred in those years, either.

Table A: Ambient PM_{10} Monitoring Data

	2003		2004		2005	
	Date	**$\mu g/m^3$**	**Date**	**$\mu g/m^3$**	**Date**	**$\mu g/m^3$**
Anaheim-Pampas Lane AQ Station						
First high	Mar 28	96	Oct 6	74	Jan 22	65
Second high	Nov 23	77	Dec 14	70	Oct 31	54
Third high	Dec 5	65	Mar 16	62	Nov 6	53
Fourth high	Dec 17	56	Mar 22	61	Dec 12	45
No. days above national 24-hour standard (150 $\mu g/m^3$)		0		0		0
National annual average		32.8		33.9		28.2
Exceeded national annual average standard (50 $\mu g/m^3$)?		No		No		No
Los Angeles-North Main St. AQ Station						
First high	Oct 24	81	Oct 6	72	Mar 11	70
Second high	Dec 5	76	Mar 16	64	Jan 22	68
Third high	Oct 6	60	Mar 10	58	Nov 6	68
Fourth high	Jun 2	58	Mar 22	54	Nov 24	51
No. days above national 24-hour standard (150 $\mu g/m^3$)		0		0		0
National annual average		34.7		32.7		29.6
Exceeded national annual average standard (50 $\mu g/m^3$)?		No		No		No

ARB Web: http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/welcome.html, July 2006.

While the current levels of PM_{10} in the project vicinity are below federal standards, indications are that levels in the future will decrease even further. The 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) published by SCAQMD reports that the Basin is expected to be in attainment for federal PM_{10} standards by the end of 2006. Tables 2-23 and 2-25 on pages V-2-57 and V-2-58, respectively, in Appendix V of the 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) show the projected maximum 24-hour average PM_{10} concentrations for the Anaheim area to be 137.5 and 115.8 $\mu g/m^3$ for 2006 and 2010, respectively. This decrease in emissions in the future is largely due to continued improvements in emissions control technologies. To estimate what the background PM_{10} concentration will be in 2025, a straight-line projection was made from the 2006 and 2010 values, predicting an ambient

concentration of approximately 35 $\mu g/m^3$ by 2025. The projected maximum 24-hour average PM_{10} concentration for the Los Angeles area (the second closest site in the AQMP to the project area) is 116.7 and 93.7 $\mu g/m^3$ for 2006 and 2010, respectively. Using a straight-line projection, that level would be less than 10 $\mu g/m^3$ by 2025.

Baseline $PM_{2.5}$ Emissions

The monitored $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations at the Anaheim-Pampas Lane Station and at the Los Angeles-North Main St. Station are shown in Table B. These data show that the federal 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ AAQS (65 $\mu g/m^3$) has not been exceeded at either the Anaheim or the Los Angeles-North Main St. Station in the last three years. The Anaheim-Pampas Lane Station shows that the annual average $PM_{2.5}$ concentration fell below the federal annual arithmetic mean standard (15 $\mu g/m^3$) in 2005. The annual average $PM_{2.5}$ at the Los Angeles-North Main St. Station was exceeded in all three years; however, as at the Anaheim-Pampas Lane Station, the concentration continues to diminish every year.

Table B: Ambient $PM_{2.5}$ Monitoring Data

	2003 $\mu g/m^3$	2004 $\mu g/m^3$	2005 $\mu g/m^3$
Anaheim-Pampas Lane AQ Station			
3-year average 98th percentile	53.3	49.3	47.3
Exceeds federal 24-hour standard (65 $\mu g/m^3$)?	No	No	No
National Annual average	17.3	16.8	14.7
Exceeds federal annual average standard (15 $\mu g/m^3$)?	Yes	Yes	No
Los Angeles-North Main St. AQ Station			
3-year average 98th percentile	58.0	60.7	60.3
Exceeds federal 24-hour standard (65 $\mu g/m^3$)?	No	No	No
National Annual average	21.3	19.7	17.8
Exceeds federal annual average standard (15 $\mu g/m^3$)?	Yes	Yes	Yes

EPA Web: http://www.epa.gov/air/data/monvals.html?st~CA~California, July 2006.
NA = 3-year average 98th percentile data not available.

While the current levels of $PM_{2.5}$ in the project vicinity are generally below the federal 24-hour standard, indications are that levels in the future will go down even further. To estimate what the background $PM_{2.5}$ concentration will be in the project opening year, 2015, an exponential projection was made of the Anaheim-Pampas Lane 3-year 98th percentile levels (the 2003 AQMP does not have any projections for $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations). This predicts that the $PM_{2.5}$ concentration would be less than 25 $\mu g/m^3$, which is approximately 39 percent of the federal 24-hr $PM_{2.5}$ standard. The exponential projection for the Los Angeles levels indicates that the $PM_{2.5}$ concentration would be approximately 58 $\mu g/m^3$, which is approximately 89 percent of the federal 24-hr $PM_{2.5}$ standard.

When projected to 2030, the 24-hour and annual average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations experienced at both stations are significantly lower than the current levels. Based on the historical 24-hour and annual

average $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and their projections, constant decrease is anticipated in the future. This trend is consistent with the ARB's plan to achieve attainment for $PM_{2.5}$ by 2010. The Initial Attainment State Implementation Plan (SIP) submittal to the EPA is anticipated by April 5, 2008.

Transportation and Traffic Conditions

Existing average daily traffic volumes, truck percentage, and average daily truck volumes for I-5 within the project limits are tabulated below.

Table C: I-5 Existing Conditions

	AADT	% of Trucks (3 or more Axles)	Truck AADT (3 or more Axles)
I-5 in 2004	**430,000**	4.6	**19,553**

Source: Caltrans web site (www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/saferesr/trafdata/) retrieved August 9, 2006.

The table indicates that the facility currently experiences more than 10,000 trucks AADT. In terms of traffic congestion experienced by motorists, the traffic analysis for this project described the facility as operating at LOS F. LOS F indicates that typical motorists would experience traffic congestion for more than 15 minutes but less than 1 hour during peak hours.

Traffic Changes Due to the Proposed Project

The proposed project is a highway expansion project that increases the capacity of I-5. This type of project improves freeway mainline and interchange operations by reducing traffic congestion and improving ingress/egress movements. Table D shows that, based on the Traffic Analysis (LSA Associates, Inc., February 2004), all the Build Alternatives would result in an overall increase in traffic volumes on the I-5; however, the hourly peak number of vehicles per lane would be reduced compared to the No Build Alternative. Thus, the efficiency of the traffic flow would be better for all the Build Alternatives compared to the No Build Alternative. Improved traffic flow efficiency is directly related to vehicle engine operating efficiency, which directly affects pollutant emission rates, including $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10}.

Table D: I-5 PM Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes for 2030

Roadway Link	Total[1]	Traffic per Lane[2]
No Build Alternative (3 Lane/4 Lane Mix)	20,793	6,700
4 Lane/1 HOV Alternative	20,857	4,359
4 Lane/2 HOV Alternative	20,918	3,776
5 Lane/1 HOV Alternative	22,064	3,809

Source: LSA Associates, Inc., February 2004.

The Caltrans traffic data shows that the existing traffic on the I-5 between SR-91 and SR-605 was approximately 4.6 percent heavy vehicles (3+ axle trucks). This project is not expected to have any effect on this percentage. The project does not provide additional truck capacity as a design purpose.

1 Total hourly traffic for PM peak hour, including all traffic (cars & trucks).
2 Capacity of HOV Lane is 75 percent of capacity of Mixed Flow Lane.

The project adds HOV lanes, which in the Los Angeles area accommodate primarily gasoline-fueled light duty and alternative-fueled (typically CNG or LNG) transit vehicles. State and local (South Coast Air Quality Management District) transit fleet rules essentially prohibit the acquisition of diesel-powered transit vehicles for use in the South Coast air basin.

The University of California, Davis (UCD) has performed studies[1] for Caltrans indicating that, in the absence of unusual circumstances or existing conditions (monitored) that are above or within 80 percent of the federal 24-hr PM_{10} standard (150 $\mu g/m^3$), a transportation facility in California is unlikely to cause or experience a localized PM_{10} problem unless the immediate vicinity is already at or above this federal standard. The PM_{10} level projected for 2025 (approximately 35 $\mu g/m^3$) is approximately 23 percent of the federal 24-hr PM_{10} standard.

Additionally, the three-year 99th percentile average PM_{10} concentration measured at the Anaheim-Pampas Lane Station is 54 $\mu g/m^3$, which is approximately 33 percent of the federal 24-hr PM_{10} standard. On the basis of the AQMP projections for PM_{10}, it is unlikely that the project area would experience a localized PM_{10} problem. Therefore, it is expected that any of the Build Alternatives would contribute to a PM_{10} hotspot that would cause or contribute to violations of the 24-hr PM_{10} National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

CONCLUSION

Transportation conformity is required under CAA section 176(c) to ensure that federally supported highway and transit project activities are consistent with the purpose of the state air quality implementation plan (SIP). Conformity to the purpose of the SIP means that transportation activities will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the relevant NAAQS. As required by the March 10, 2006 final rule, this qualitative $PM_{2.5}$ hot-spot analysis demonstrates that this project meets the CAA conformity requirements to support state and local air quality goals with respect to potential localized air quality impacts.

It is not expected that changes to $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} emissions levels associated with the proposed project would result in a new violation because any increased emissions that might affect concentrations would be offset by the decreasing ambient $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} emissions and concentrations at the project location described above. In other words, any increase in the emissions of $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} due to increased traffic volumes associated with future growth and the proposed project would be offset by decreases in the background concentrations. Additionally, $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} emissions will be reduced due to implementation of the proposed project because the efficiency of the traffic flow would be better for all the Build Alternatives compared to the No Build Alternative.

Federal regulations and the State's Diesel Risk Reduction Plan will require future diesel vehicles to have substantially cleaner engines and to use fuels with lower sulfur contents. Thus, even though the project will have an increase in diesel truck traffic in all future analysis years, the increase will be more than offset by the larger decrease in per-vehicle $PM_{2.5}$ emissions. Therefore, the project will not cause higher $PM_{2.5}$ emissions or a $PM_{2.5}$ hot-spot.

[1] Caltrans Interim Guidance: Project-Level PM_{10} Hot-Spot Analysis, Prepared by Doug Eisinger and Tom Kear (UCD), and Mike Brady (Caltrans), February 2000.

The historical meteorological and climatic data, monitored $PM_{2.5}$ emissions data and their declining trend, current and projected traffic data, and the Federal regulations and the State's Plan, support the assertion that the project will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the relevant NAAQS. Activities of this project should, therefore, be considered that they are consistent with the purpose of the SIP and it should be determined that this project conforms to the requirements of the CAA.

RTIP ID# *(required)* ORA020108

Project Description *(clearly describe project)*

The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 12 Traffic Operations South, proposes modifications to improve the existing southbound exit ramp of the Interstate-5 (I-5) interchange within the limits of the City of Irvine, County of Orange. The project was initiated to address congestion occurring at the southbound exit ramp. The viable project alternatives include the following:

(1.) No Build Alternative: The No Build Alternative proposes no improvements to the project area.

(2.) Build Alternative: The Build Alternative proposes the following improvements:

- Widen the existing southbound 1-lane exit ramp to provide a 2-lane exit ramp;
- Widen the existing 3-lane ramp termini to provide a fourth and fifth lane;
- Modify the traffic signal system;
- Construct two Maintenance Vehicle Pull-outs (MVPs);
- Modify the Culver Drive median to conform to the new intersection configuration;
- Remove and replace roadway signage and striping;
- Remove and replace affected drainage facilities; and
- Construct Best Management Practices (BMPs).

The project was included in the 2001 Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan (SCAG RTP) and is currently included in the 2004 SCAG RTP. The project is identified as a Category 4B Operational Improvement and is a candidate to be funded from the 2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) under the Regional Improvement Program. The project will be a State/Federal funded project if funded through the STIP.

A Project Study Report (PSR) was developed by Caltrans District 12 engineering staff and approved in February 2002. Project Study Report review and concurrence was provided by the FHWA Senior Transportation Engineer in February 2001. The Project Report was approved by Caltrans in December 2004. While the project is on the interstate system, it is not an interstate completion project nor is it categorized as new construction or reconstruction. Therefore, per the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 and FHWA/Caltrans stewardship agreements, this project is exempt from full FHWA oversight.

Type of Project *(use Table 1 on instruction sheet)*
Reconfigure existing interchange

County	**Narrative Location/Route & Postmiles** 12-ORA-5-KP 42.8/43.6 (PM 26.6/27.1)
Orange	**Caltrans Projects – EA#** 0C6401

Lead Agency:

Contact Person	**Phone#**	**Fax#**	**Email**
Dipak Roy	714-560-5863	714-560-5794	droy@octa.net

Hot Spot Pollutant of Concern *(check one or both)* **PM2.5 X** **PM10 X**

Federal Action for which Project-Level PM Conformity is Needed *(check appropriate box)*

Categorical Exclusion (NEPA)	**EA or Draft EIS**	**FONSI or Final EIS**	**X**	**PS&E or Construction**	**Other**

Scheduled Date of Federal Action: December 2004

Current Programming Dates *as appropriate*

	PE/Environmental	**ENG**	**ROW**	**CON**
Start	12/2003	4/2006	11/2006	11/2007
End	12/2004	1/2007	2/2007	5/2008

Project Purpose and Need (Summary): *(attach additional sheets as necessary)*
The purpose of the I-5/Culver Drive southbound exit ramp modifications is to mitigate existing and forecast operational deficiencies. A traffic operation investigation determined that traffic queuing occurs along the southbound exit ramp that extends onto the southbound I-5 mainline. On the southbound I-5 mainline, there are seven travel lanes; one auxiliary lane, five general-purpose lanes and one HOV lane. The auxiliary lane ends at the Culver Drive exit ramp where the ramp provides a single lane exit which then widens to a three-lane ramp which provides one right-turn lane, one optional right/left-turn lane and one left-turn lane. The existing single lane exit results in congestion on the I-5 mainline. The Highway Design Manual (Section 504.3.5) states a single lane exit ramp can only accommodate 1,500 vehicles per hour; however, the present day peak hour volume is 1,993 vehicles per hour. The exit ramp presently operates at Level of Service (LOS) F.

Mitigation of the exit ramp operational deficiency will be accomplished through two ramp modifications. First, the exit ramp will be widened by 3.6 meters to provide a two-lane exit ramp configuration which allows traffic in lane number 5 of the southbound I-5 to either exit the mainline without weaving to the auxiliary lane or to continue south. Second, the two-lane exit configuration will then widen to five 3.6 meter lanes providing two right-turn lanes and three left-turn lanes. The proposed improvements will alleviate divergence congestion problems on the I-5 mainline, increase storage of the exit ramp, minimize congestion related to queuing back up the ramp onto the mainline, and increase ramp operational efficiency through distribution of vehicles in four lanes to balance turning movements. With the proposed improvements, the exit ramp will operate at LOS C for existing traffic volumes.

A byproduct of the five-lane ramp configuration will be the mitigation of a forecast operational deficiency. With the existing 3-lane configuration, the Culver Drive/I-5 southbound ramp intersection currently operates at LOS C; however by the Year 2030 the intersection will operate at LOS F. With the proposed 5-lane ramp configuration, the intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS E in the Year 2030.

Surrounding Land Use/Traffic Generators *(especially effect on diesel traffic)*
Land uses in the project vicinity include freeway, residential, and commercial with agricultural uses to the northeast across the freeway. There are no immediate surrounding uses that generate a significant amount of diesel truck trips.

Opening Year: Build and No Build LOS, AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT of proposed facility
Existing volumes are shown in Table 1 (Existing Traffic Data). Note, that as this project consists of an interchange reconfiguration, traffic volumes and fleet mixes would not change between the Build and No Build options.

Table 1
Existing Traffic Data

	Existing					
	No Build			Build		
	AADT	% Heavy Trucks[1]	# Heavy Trucks	AADT	% Heavy Trucks[1]	# Heavy Trucks
I-5/Culver Drive Southbound Ramps						
SB Exit	19,930	6.5	1,295	19,930	6.5	1,295
I-5 Mainline						
North of I-5/Culver Dr.	316,000	6.5	20,540	316,000	6.5	20,540

1 – Note that the truck percentage conservatively derived from the percent of heavy truck traffic along Interstate 5. Actual truck percentages are expected to be much lower. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/saferesr/trafdata/truck2005final.pdf

Table 2 (Existing LOS) summarizes the existing Build and No Build AM peak hour and PM peak hour LOS of the study intersections.

Table 2
Existing LOS

Intersections	Existing No Build		Existing Plus Proposed Improvements	
	AM Peak Hour LOS	PM Peak Hour LOS	AM Peak Hour LOS	PM Peak Hour LOS
SB I-5 Off-Ramp/Culver Drive	B	C	B	C
Trabuco Road/Culver Drive	B	C	B	B
NB I-5 Off-Ramp/Trabuco Road	B	C	B	C

RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: Build and No Build LOS, AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT of proposed facility
Year 2030 volumes are shown in Table 2 (Opening Year Traffic Data). Note, that as this project consists of an interchange reconfiguration, traffic volumes and fleet mixes would not change between the Build and No Build options.

Table 1
Year 2030 Traffic Data

	Existing					
	No Build			Build		
	AADT	% Heavy Trucks[1]	# Heavy Trucks	AADT	% Heavy Trucks[1]	# Heavy Trucks
I-5/Culver Drive Southbound Ramps						
SB Exit	25,790	6.5	1,676	25,790	6.5	1,676
I-5 Mainline						
North of I-5/Culver Dr.	336,000	6.5	21,840	336,000	6.5	21,840

1 – Note that the truck percentage conservatively derived from the percent of heavy truck traffic along Interstate 5. Actual truck percentages are expected to be much lower. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/saferesr/trafdata/truck2005final.pdf

Table 4 (Year 2030 LOS) summarizes the existing Build and No Build AM peak hour and PM peak hour LOS of the study intersections.

Table 2
Year 2030 LOS

Intersections	Existing No Build		Existing Plus Proposed Improvements	
	AM Peak Hour LOS	PM Peak Hour LOS	AM Peak Hour LOS	PM Peak Hour LOS
SB I-5 Off-Ramp/Culver Drive	C	E	C	D
Trabuco Road/Culver Drive	B	F	B	D
NB I-5 Off-Ramp/Trabuco Road	C	C	C	C

Opening Year: If facility is an interchange(s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT
Refer to Tables 1 and 2 above.

RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: If facility is an interchange (s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT
Refer to Tables 3 and 4 above.

Describe potential traffic redistribution effects of congestion relief *(impact on other facilities)*
Some traffic delays can be expected during construction of the project. However, the traffic impacts during construction are only temporary in nature and will cease upon completion of construction activities. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) is being developed and incorporated as part of the project design prior to the onset of construction to minimize disruption to the existing traffic flow conditions. All potentially affected agencies would be notified of the proposed project, and their input incorporated into the TMP.

During the operational phase, the proposed project would result in the modification of the southbound exit ramp to address congestion. No modifications to the existing I-5 mainline are planned as part of the project. Thus, local traffic is not expected to be significantly redistributed.

Comments/Explanation/Details *(attach additional sheets as necessary)*
Conformity determinations require the analysis of direct and indirect emissions associated with the proposed project and compare them to the without project condition. If the total of direct and indirect emissions from the project reaches or exceeds regionally significant thresholds, the Lead Agency must perform a conformity determination to demonstrate the positive conformity of the federal action. As determined by the Caltrans District 12 Environmental Planning Branch in the approved PSR, the proposed Build Alternative is a non-capacity enhancing operational improvement project and significant environmental impacts are not anticipated. In February 2002, the PSR stated that a Categorical Exemption/Categorical Exclusion (CE/CE) would be the appropriate environmental document for the project based on the results of the preliminary environmental evaluation. In November 2003, Caltrans and FHWA entered into a new Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Agreement (PCE Agreement) that further defines actions that do not normally have a significant impact on the environment. Projects that are consistent with the PCE Agreement do not require FHWA review and approval of the Categorical Exclusion and Caltrans is delegated signature authority. In July 2004, Caltrans District 12 Environmental Planning staff agreed that the PCE would be the appropriate environmental document for the project. The PCE was signed and approved by FHWA on December 2004 (See Attached).

In April 2003, the City of Irvine (COI) completed the North Irvine Transportation Mitigation (NITM) Program Nexus Study. The purpose of the NITM Program is to establish a funding mechanism for the transportation improvement mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) for three future development projects in north Irvine: 1) Spectrum 8/Planning Area 40, 2) Irvine Northern Sphere Area, and 3) the Orange County Great Park. Included in the NITM Program is the addition of a fifth lane to the I-5 southbound exit ramp. The project was initiated by the City of Irvine to mitigate increased traffic congestion associated with future development and implementation of the City of Irvine General Plan. The improvements are proposed to ensure all highway facilities within the interchange area continue to operate at acceptable levels of service as forecast traffic volumes increase.

The project is included in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) *2004 Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP). The project is also programmed within the adopted *2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program* (RTIP) as a State Highway Project:

#ORA020108: I-5 AT CULVER DRIVE S/B OFFRAMP WIDENING FROM ONE TO TWO LANES.

As noted above, under the Forecast year 2030 No Build Condition, the study intersections are forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS (LOS E and F). With the proposed improvements, the study intersections are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better). Although the I-5 mainline experiences two-way volumes in excess of 125,000 vehicles per day (vpd), the total volume of heavy truck traffic IS 6.5 percent. Actual percentages are anticipated to be much lower. Note that this interchange does not serves any ports, rail yards or other significant sources of particulate matter.

Based upon the information provided above, the project is not expected to introduce significant amounts of diesel truck traffic and is not considered a project of significant concern per the definition contained within 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1). Thus, a less than significant impact with respect to $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} would occur.

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION/PROGRAMMATIC CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
DETERMINATION FORM

12-ORA-5	KP 42.78 (PM 26.58)	0C6400	2796
Dist.-Co.-Rte. (or Local Agency)	K.P./K.P.(P.M./P.M.)	E.A. (State project)	Proj. No. (PPNO)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: (Briefly describe project, purpose, location, limits, right-of-way requirements, and activities involved.)

Widen the southbound off-ramp at Interstate 5 (I-5) and Culver Drive, in the city of Irvine in south/central Orange County, California. Project would reconfigure the exit lane (approximately 550 meters long) from one to two 3.6-meter lanes. At the intersection, lanes would open up from three (existing) *(continued next page)*

CEQA COMPLIANCE *(for State Projects only)*

Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the following statements (see 14 CCR 15300 et seq.):

- If this project falls within exempt class 3, 4, 5, 6 or 11, it does not impact an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped and officially adopted pursuant to law.
- There will not be a significant cumulative effect by this project and successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time.
- There is not a reasonable possibility that the project will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.
- This project does not damage a scenic resource within an officially designated state scenic highway.
- This project is not located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Govt. Code § 65962.5 ("Cortese List").
- This project does not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

CALTRANS CEQA DETERMINATION

☐ **Exempt by Statute** (PRC 21080)
Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the above statements, the project is:
☒ **Categorically Exempt. Class 1c**, or ☐ **General Rule exemption** (This project does not fall within an exempt class, but it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity may have a significant effect on the environment [CCR 15061(b)(3)])

Signature: Environmental Office Chief	12/15/04 Date	Signature: Project Manager	12/15/04 Date

NEPA COMPLIANCE (23 CFR 771.117)

Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the following statements:

- This project does not have a significant impact on the environment as defined by the NEPA.
- This project does not involve substantial controversy on environmental grounds.
- This project does not involve significant impacts on properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT Act or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
- In nonattainment or maintenance areas for Federal air quality standards: this project comes from a currently conforming plan and Transportation Improvement Program or is exempt form regional conformity.
- This project is consistent with all Federal, State, & local laws, requirements or administrative determinations relating to the environmental aspects of this action.

Programmatic Categorical Exclusion have been met.

NEPA DETERMINATION

Based on an examination of this proposal, supporting information, and the statements above under "NEPA Compliance", it is determined that the project is a:

☒ **PROGRAMMATIC CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (PCE):** Based on the evaluation of this project and supporting documentation in the project files, all the conditions of the November 18, 2003 Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Agreement have been met.

☐ **CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CE):** For actions that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental effect and are excluded from the requirement to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Requires FHWA Determination.

Signature: Environmental Office Chief	12/15/04 Date	Signature: Project Manager/DLA Engineer	12/15/04 Date

FHWA DETERMINATION

Based on the evaluation of this project and the statements above, it is determined that the project meets the criteria of and is properly classified as a Categorical Exclusion (CE).

N/A	
Signature: FHWA Project Devel. Engineer	Date

☒ Additional information is attached or referenced, as appropriate (e.g. Mitigation commitments for NEPA only; Air Quality studies or documentation of exemption from regional conformity or use of CO Protocol; §106 commitments; §4(f) or Programmatic §4(f); date of COE nationwide permit; § 7 species survey results; Wetlands Finding; Floodplain Finding; additional studies; design conditions.) **Rev. 11/2003**

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION/PROGRAMMATIC CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
DETERMINATION FORM
CONTINUATION SHEET

12-ORA-5	KP 42.78 (PM 26.48)	0C6400	2796
Dist.-Co.-Rte. (or Local Agency)	K.P./K.P.(P.M./P.M.)	E.A. (State project)	Proj. No. (PPNO.)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (continued):
to four 3.6-meter lanes. Shoulder widths and the length of the ramp would remain the same. All work is to be done in the existing State right-of-way. This project may include soil borings.

No significant environmental consequences are anticipated with the proposed project. In addition to the measures relating to construction noise, air pollution control, water pollution control, and erosion, as given in the Caltrans Standard Specifications, the following measures are required:

Water Quality

1. Construction within Caltrans right of way shall conform to the Statewide National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CAS000003, and to the General NPDES Permit for Construction Activities No. CAS000002, and any subsequent General Permit in effect at the time of bid announcement.

2. The project is located within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The Santa Ana RWQCB requires that all projects submit a Notification of Construction (NOC) within 30 days prior to any soil-disturbing activities.

Cultural Resources

3. Potentially significant historic materials may exist in a subsurface context in some areas. A qualified archaeological monitor of ground-breaking activities within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) should be provided by a qualified archaeologist familiar with historic materials from the pre-1900 period.

4. Any archaeological deposits identified during the monitoring are to be evaluated for their potential to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources.

5. If human remains are discovered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that disturbances and activities shall cease. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately so that he/she may ascertain the origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. Further, the Caltrans District 12 Archaeologist must be notified of the find immediately.

6. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), who will then notify the Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD may inspect the remains with the approval of the landowner or the authorized representative. The MLD must complete this inspection within 24 hours after notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis.

Biology

7. A survey for active raptor nests is required seven days prior to commencement of construction during the breeding season (February 1 to June 30). Any occupied nests found during the survey efforts must be mapped on the construction plans. Some restrictions on construction activities may be required in the vicinity of the nest until the nest is no longer active, as determined by a qualified biologist.

Air Quality

8. This project matches the design concept and scope described in the Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program, and it does not delay timely implementation of the Transportation Control Measures identified in the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan.

ADOPTED 2006 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RTIP) STATE HIGHWAY PROJECTS

Orange County

LEAD AGENCY	PROJECT ID	AIR BASIN	MODEL NO	PROG CODE	RTE	POST BEG	MI END	DESCRIPTION	FUND	YEAR	ENG	ROW	CONS	TOTAL	PRIOR	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10-2011/12	PROJECT TOTAL	CONF CAT	ELMT
ORANGE COUNTY TRANS AUTHORITY (OCTA)	ORA020108	SCAB	0262	NCRH3	5	26.9	26.9	I-5 AT CULVER DRIVE S/B OFFRAMP WIDENING FROM ONE TO TWO LANES	NH-RIP	PRIOR	309	15	0	324	324	0	0	1903	0	2227	NON-EXEMPT	4
									STCASH	R08/09	0	0	1903	1903								
CALTRANS	ORA120359	SCAG	0309	CAR63	5	27.5	28.1	I-5 @ JAMBOREE - CONSTRUCT AUX LN ON I-5 SB; WIDEN SB OFF-RAMP FROM 1 TO 2 LANES; AND WIDENING JAMBOREE RD EB UNDERCROSSING TO CREATE A TURN LANE TO NB ON-RAMP	STCASH	R08/09	918	48	0	966	0	0	0	966	7106	8072	NON-EXEMPT	3
									STCASH	R10/11	0	0	7106	7106								
ANAHEIM	ORA000100	SCAB	2006	CAN72	5	34.0	43.5	GENE AUTRY WAY WEST @ I-5 (I-5 HOV TRANSITWAY TO HASTER) ADD OVERCROSSING ON I-5 (S)/MANCHESTER AND EXTEND GENE AUTRY WAY WEST FROM I-5 TO HASTER (3 LANES IN EA DIR.)	DEMOT21	PRIOR	0	6333	0	6333	18400	4271	0	9212	0	31883	TCM	4
									ORA-RIP	PRIOR	0	4330	0	4330								
									CITY	PRIOR	700	7037	0	7737								
									ORA-RIP	06/07	0	0	4271	4271								
									CITY	08/09	0	0	9212	9212								
ORANGE COUNTY TRANS AUTHORITY (OCTA)	ORA000193	SCAB	0343	CAR62	22	.0	.7	SR-22/I-405 AND I-405/I-605 INTERCHANGES - HOV TO HOV LANE CONNECTORS.	CMAQ	06/07	0	0	39481	39481	0	39481	41857	192304	16358	290000	TCM	2
									CMAQ	07/08	0	0	41857	41857								
									CMAQ	08/09	0	0	42304	42304								
									ORA-FWY	08/09	0	0	150000	150000								
									CMAQ	09/10	0	0	16358	16358								
GARDEN GROVE	ORA981104	SCAB	0263	CAX63	22	7.8	.0	RECONSTRUCT HARBOR BLVD INTERCHANGE. 4 LANES EACH DIRECTION (1/4 MILE BEFORE AND AFTER SR-22 RAMPS) 2 HOV LNES(1 E/B & 1 W/B) AND PROPOSED SR-22 HOV LANES.	CITY	PRIOR	104	275	0	379	2179	2615	0	0	0	4794	TCM	4
									DEMOT21	PRIOR	0	0	1500	1500								
									ORA-GMA	PRIOR	0	0	300	300								
									ORA-RIP	06/07	0	0	2615	2615								
COSTA MESA	ORA120321	SCCAB		STUDY	55	.0	.0	COSTA MESA - SR-55 DOWNGRADE STUDY ONLY (REMOVE FREEWAY DESIGNATION ON NEWPORT BLVD SOUTH OF 19TH STREET)	CITY	09/10	300	0	0	300	0	0	0	0	300	300	EXEMPT	1
COSTA MESA	ORA000161	SCAB	0205	CAR63	55	1.5	2.0	NEWPORT BLVD (SR-55 TO 17TH ST) - WIDENING FROM 6 TO 7/8 THROUGH LANES. WIDEN 1 LANE N/B FROM 17TH TO 19TH AND 1 LANE S/B FROM 19TH TO BROADWAY	STPL-R	PRIOR	700	0	0	700	850	4895	0	0	0	5745	NON-EXEMPT	4
									ORA-GMA	PRIOR	95	55	0	150								
									CITY	06/07	0	0	4500	4500								
									ORA-GMA	06/07	0	0	395	395								
COSTA MESA	ORA015	SCAB		NCRH1	55	5.3	5.3	BAKER STREET AND SR-55; N/B & S/B FRONTAGE ROAD IMPROVEMENTS. S/B FREE RIGHT TURN, N/B LEFT-TURN AND 2ND E/B LEFT.	CITY	09/10	90	0	610	700	0	0	0	0	700	700	EXEMPT	1
COSTA MESA	ORA016	SCAB	0265	NCRH1	55	5.8	5.8	PAULARINO AVE (SR-55 @ PAULARINO AVE) IN COSTA MESA INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT. ADDING A N/B RAMP AND W/B RIGHT-TURN-LANE.	CITY	09/10	60	0	0	60	0	0	0	0	505	505	NON-EXEMPT	1
									CITY	10/11	0	170	0	170								
									CITY	11/12	0	0	275	275								
COSTA MESA	ORA017	SCAB		NCRH1	55	5.8	5.8	PAULARINO AVE IN COSTA MESA. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT ADD S/B RIGHT-TURN LANE.	CITY	09/10	50	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	270	270	EXEMPT	1
									CITY	10/11	0	0	220	220								
IRVINE	550	SCAB	2204	CAR63	55	7.5	7.6	ALTON AVE IN SANTA ANA CONSTRUCT A NEW 4-LANE (2E/B AND 2W/B) OVERCROSSING & HOV ACCESS RAMPS @SR-55 -	DEV FEE	06/07	1110	0	0	1110	0	3500	0	0	0	3500	NON-EXEMPT	2
									ORA-GMA	06/07	710	0	0	710								
									ORA-RIP	06/07	1680	0	0	1680								
ORANGE, CITY OF	ORA000146	SCAB	0203	CAN70	55	16.1	16.1	MEATS AVE @ SR55 INTERCHANGE. CONSTRUCT ON-RAMP/OFF-RAMPS. PART OF SR-55 ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS.(0 TO 2 LANES)	CITY	06/07	200	0	0	200	0	200	0	0	0	200	NON-EXEMPT	1
BREA	ORA000107	SCAB	0277	CAR63	57	19.9	20.9	AT LAMBERT IN CITY OF BREA. FWY/ARTERIAL (FROM 2 TO 3 LANES) ON RAMP	ORA-RIP	PRIOR	0	0	320	320	320	0	0	1970	0	2290	NON-EXEMPT	2
									CITY	08/09	985	0	0	985								
									DEMOT21	08/09	985	0	0	985								
BREA	ORA120320	SCAB	0292	NCRH3	57	20.9	.0	SR-57/LAMBERT RD INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS - RECONFIG EXISTING DIAMOND INTERCHANGE TO LOOP RAMP, ADD SB LN ON OFFRAMP	CITY	10/11	0	0	18000	18000	0	0	0	0	18000	18000	NON-EXEMPT	2
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO	ORA000152	SCAB	0305	PLN40	74	.0	.2	ORTEGA HWY (RANCHO VIEJO RD TO JUST EAST OF I-5/SR-74 INTERCHAGE) RDWAY WIDEN ADD RT TRN LNE TO CAPAC & REDUCE QUE ON WB SR-74 TO NB I-5 TRN. N/B FRM 2TO3 & S/B 2TO3 .	CITY	06/07	50	0	0	50	0	2550	0	0	0	2550	NON-EXEMPT	3
									ORA-RIP	06/07	2500	0	0	2500								